



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

for them. The *secutores* who fought with the *retiarii* were really *Samnites* and their equipment was the same. In Cicero ad Att. VII 14, 2 we may not read with Friedlaender *secutorum*, but must keep *scutorum* of the MSS, so that the earliest mention of *secutores* occurs in Suetonius Cal. 30. Another designation of them is found in CIL VI 631 > RET = contra rete. The *oplomachi* had also substantially the same equipment as the *Samnites*, and the name was introduced at the beginning of the Empire. They differed from the *secutores* especially in that they were matched with the *Thraeces* and not with the *retiarii*. Their helmets too were quite unlike. *Retiarii* lasted as long as gladiatorial exhibitions, but when they came into fashion cannot be definitely determined. An interesting description of their armor is given. They fought with *murmillo*nes and *secutores*; had neither *galea* nor *scutum*, but were furnished with a *galerus* (cf. Juvenal Sat. VIII 207, of which Meier gives a new interpretation). The name *Thraeces* indicates that Thracians taken in war were compelled to fight in the arena. In inscriptions *Thraex* is the more ancient, *Threx* the later form. TR also occurs, but *Thrax* is not authenticated. They fought with *secutores* and *murmillo*nes, and also with each other as appears from some *lucernae* at Berlin and Trier. Not so clear is the attempted proof from a Greek inscription CIG 2164, that the *murmillo*nes were pitted against each other. These latter took their name from the *μορμύρος* or *μορμύλος*, a fish which was attached to the helmet to be caught by the net of the *retiarius*. They were earlier called *galli*, which name went out of use at the end of the republic. The famous statue of the dying gladiator has lately been rechristened 'the dying Gaul'. Curiously enough, if we accept Weissenborn's view followed by Meier. Livy XXXIX.42, 11, *vis tu, inquit, quoniam gladiatorum spectaculum reliquisti, iam hunc Gallum morientem videre?* points to the fact that the Gauls were known as gladiators as early as the time of Cato the Censor.

Chapter III treats of *Quaestiones diversae* under the following heads: § 1. *De significatione "stans missus est."* § 2. *De suppositiciis seu tertiaris.* § 3. *De gladiatorum ordinibus.* What we have already said will, we hope, lead those who take a lively interest in gladiators to read these sections, of which it is impossible to give here even a summary.

M. W.

Einleitung in das Sprachstudium, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Methodik der vergleichenden Sprachforschung, von B. DELBRÜCK. Leipzig, Breitkopf und Härtel, 1880.

Introduction to the Study of Language, etc., by DELBRÜCK. Authorized translation by E. CHANNING. Leipzig, 1882.

This work with the authorized translation, to which a special preface is added by the author for the "English and American public," appears as the fourth volume of the Indogermanische Grammatiken. The purpose of the book is to give a short account of the development of philological study since the time of Bopp. The main title is slightly misleading, as the words "zur Geschichte," which are added in the sub-title, explains the real drift of the essay. It is not so much an introduction to the study of language from the standpoint of philological principles and their application, but rather an historical sketch with here and there an independent discussion of the theories involved.

The cis-Rhenish student will be apt to agree with the author's remark in his preface to the English translation, that the men who have contributed to linguistic research in England, France, and America have been somewhat neglected. 'In fact, to explain the nature of the essay the title should rather have been an historical introduction to the study of the works of German philologists.' But understanding this as the aim of the writer, the book may be considered a very useful summary. The author begins with Bopp, to whom 36 of the 137 pages of the work are devoted. The influence of Fried. Schlegel upon Bopp is commented upon at some length, his views on phonetic laws are discussed, s. 21, and it is pointed out (what is often overlooked) that in formulating his synopsis of phonetic changes Bopp himself belongs to those who do not insist on the inviolability of phonetic laws, but content themselves with admitting exceptions without feeling the necessity of discovering their causes. Es wird, says Delbrück, s. 23, allgemein zugestanden . . . dass Bopp auf dem Gebiet der Lautlehre seinen Nachfolgern am meisten zu thun übrig gelassen hat. Bopp's genius the author sums up as depending upon "das glückliche Aperçu" (s. 26) rather than as a result of learning and profound logical judgment.

More interesting is the following chapter, which treats of Bopp's contemporaries and successors to the time of Schleicher, Humboldt, A. W. von Schlegel, Grimm and Pott. A reminder, useful perhaps to non-German scholars, is given in the following allusion (s. 32) to "Grimm's Law" as "Das im Wesentlichen schon von Rask ausgesprochene unter Grimm's Namen gehende sogenannte Gesetz der Lautverschiebung." It is in fact one of the chief virtues of this essay that we are often reminded in it of the work done by men whose names and whose deeds have been obscured by the greater brilliancy of other scholars of the same epoch. Pott the author regards, although admitting that he has been often led aside by fancy, as one who has contributed more than any other to the establishment of sure phonetic laws.

Between the time of Pott's *Etymologische Forschungen* and Schleicher's *Compendium* important additions were made to philological science. In this period the author notes our better acquaintance with Indian literature, also the great help given by the lexicographic labor of Sanskrit scholars, the position which linguists begin to take in reference to phonetic laws, and most important of all, the attempt now made to separate with care the different languages from each other. A long section, some 15 pages, discusses August Schleicher. Passing from the question whether his Hegelian views influenced to any extent his philological opinions Delbrück shows us the main points of difference between the tendency of Schleicher and that of Bopp, and expatiates upon the one point "which best exhibits Schleicher's originality," the reconstructed Indogermanic *Ursprache*. In the *Compendium* Schleicher ascribes to this *Ursprache* an historical reality which in the *Chrestomathie* is contradicted. This point is treated p. 50 folg. As to the forms of the parent speech the author adds some sensible remarks. Whether we are to accept for this much-fought-over parent tongue the appearance at times claimed for it "lässt sich natürlich nicht bestimmen" (s. 53, s. 56.)

The chapter on *Neue Bestrebungen* is too short (s. 54-61). Worthy of chief consideration the author deems the question proposed by Merguet and answered by those scholars who have laid particular weight on the *Analogiebildung*—

especially Whitney, Scherer, Leskien—as to the possibility of new formations in separate languages when a completed inflection is postulated for the *ursprache*; and, secondly, the famous division of the *a*-sound, begun by Curtius and attacked by Brugman and others. Delbrück, of course, accepts the original *a-e* (ǣ). Finally, among recent discoveries, Osthoff's "r sonant" of the parent speech is regarded as "sehr wahrscheinlich," and Brugman's "Nasalis Sonans" is "nicht minder wichtig." We could have wished this chapter had been more extended, and more discussion given in regard to these points which the author merely notes and leaves.

From this point the historical sketch yields in part to an investigation (s. 61-102) of the Agglutination Theory. It will be scarcely necessary to speak fully on this part; the author's main conclusions are all negative. Dismissing the Evolution Theory, that pronouns are evolved from personal endings, the author takes up Ludwig's Adaptation Theory, which he finds quite as unsatisfactory as the other. According to Ludwig the so-called personal suffixes had originally nothing whatever to do with the pronouns. They were not used to designate person at all, but each suffix and pronoun arose independently. This theory is not so satisfactory as the former, because the strong resemblance of the personal suffixes to the pronouns is not explained by it, and the Vedic diversity of form is not so great as has been asserted by Ludwig. Without this latter support, however, the internal evidence is insufficient. Delbrück roundly charges Ludwig with answering the question, "Whence comes this resemblance of pronoun and personal suffix?" by a mere *Incompetenzerklärung*, or, in other words, he cannot explain it at all. In consequence the author leaves this theory as unsatisfactory, and reverts to Bopp's hypothesis that the endings arose from the pronouns. Under the three divisions of roots, noun, and verb, a detailed discussion is given. The key is struck in the first section, where, speaking of roots, the author says (s. 75): *Stellt man dennoch Wurzeln der Einzelsprachen auf, so haben diese keinen wissenschaftlichen Werth, sondern nur die Bedeutung praktischer Hilfskonstruktionen.* In regard to the form of roots, some five pages are devoted to the profitless inquiry as to whether dissyllabic roots may have existed alongside of monosyllabic ones. To those who are desirous of exact results as reward for philological labor on such themes we commend this whole chapter, s. 83. There may have been dissyllabic roots existing by the side of monosyllabic roots, *i. e.* we know nothing about it. S. 90, after discussing the views of Curtius, Scherer, Fick, Benfey u. a., in regard to the Stammbildungssuffixe, we arrive at the result: It is a matter of great doubt whether we shall ever succeed in reaching anything more than a probability in this field. S. 91, under *Casusbildung*: we may assume that case-suffixes were used at first to denote something like our present cases, and contained pronominal elements, or we can believe that stem-forming suffixes developed into case-suffixes, but "the uncertainty is here in all cases so great that after repeated consideration I have arrived at nothing but a *non liquet*." Not much more satisfaction is obtainable from the discussion of the verb which concludes the chapter. S. 99, the inflection has developed not all at once, but gradually; we cannot say however what the period of development was, for the material is not rich enough. This is the author's own confession, when he says in reviewing the whole chapter on agglutination: After a long and wearisome journey we arrived only at a bare *non liquet*, and seldom even at the possibility of

answering the question. The author therefore advises us to renounce this Sprachwissenschaftliche Metaphysik, and confine ourselves to what we can find out, making it our task to determine the fundamental forms (Schleicher's *Grundformen*) and explain from these the special forms.

At the beginning of Chapter VI, on Phonetic Laws, the author appears again as an advocate for justice, and this time in favor of Curtius. It is too often the custom with the younger school of philologists to speak of Curtius as too lax. He was, however, foremost in endeavoring to establish a sure foundation for phonetic laws. Curtius sees, however, not law so much as tendency at work in language. (Those who have heard Curtius lecture need not be reminded of the stress he is fond of laying on the "Sprachneigung.") Three principles, according to Curtius, are factors in forming language: Phonetic law, analogy, and preservation of sounds simply to conserve the sense. To this last point—sound saved by sense—Delbrück cannot agree, but proposes rather the principle of analogy. The first is the great fighting-ground of the younger school, whose shibboleth is: *phonetic laws admit of no exceptions*. Here we must, however, D. remarks, subtract all cases which are the result of analogy, for only after we have done this can we argue on phonetic laws. Even then comes the confession (s. 115): Auf inductivem Wege kann die Ausnahmslosigkeit der Lautgesetze nicht bewiesen werden. Deductively, then? Here we quote the substance of an important paragraph (s. 118), written against the idea that convenience plays an essential part in modifying inherited word-sounds, a theory maintained by Curtius and Whitney. Changes produced by climatic influences being left out of the question as a point too uncertain for argument, although maintained by Osthoff, we have to object against the theory of convenience the following facts: First, instead of asserting that love of ease plays so prominent a part in human society, we can say the opposite, viz. that most men give themselves a great deal of trouble to make their speech correspond to that of their associates (as for instance one who finds it hard to pronounce an *r* or *th*), and further, not only what suits the speaker, but what is pleasing to one's associates, is aimed at by the ordinary speaker. The principle that ease in speaking is the mainspring of phonetic change must, if this be true, be set aside. We find, then, the final cause of phonetic change in a more general theory, viz. that this occurs first in the individual, and not by the community. Such changes, originating, be it from ease, be it from fear of ridicule, be it from any other cause, starting with the individual, are propagated by imitation through whole groups or peoples. Against this lies the counterbalancing tendency to adhere to universal custom. Change in phonetic forms results from these two forces—one individualizes, the other equalizes. Finally, be it one or the other, both processes are made unconsciously. We have here the fundamental principle that underlies the development of one language from one another. Enlarging on this the author comes to two questions, where we can only note that his reply to each is a negation. First, Can it be assumed that change of sound appears in one series of words and not in another? Second, Can it be assumed that the same word-form may develop into different forms? In denying both of these propositions the author agrees with the school of Brugman, Leskien, etc. As an illustration of the latter, an example is quoted from the Greek: *μειζονος* and *μειζους* have not originated in the same dialect from *μειζονσος*, but *μειζους* arose from *μειζοσος*, whereas the other form is the

result of analogy with the nominative *μειζων*. The counter-opinion, advocated by Curtius, is that *μειζονσος* became on the one hand *μειζοσος* (*ο* = nasal vowel), then *μειζοσος*, *μειζος*; and at last *μειζους*; on the other hand it became *μειζοννος*, then *μειζονος*. In criticising these theories we can observe that each is possible, neither is proved. The theory here advocated by Delbrück may commend itself to some scholars, as that of Curtius to others. It seems to us that this, like the agglutination theory, results merely in the same "kahles *non liquet*." Without sufficient data we may amuse but never satisfy ourselves.

The last chapter of this work gives us a review of the "separation of the races." It was Schleicher who first gave us the figure of the genealogical tree. Inside of this, as a result of the Völkertrennungen, he accepts three main groups: Asiatic, Slavo-Germanic, Greco-Italo-Celtic. Lottner divides into two, Asiatic and European. The latter is characterized by a common *l* in opposition to the Asiatic *r*. To this Curtius added the European *e* opposed to Asiatic *a*. Then comes the renowned "Wave-theory" of Johannes Schmidt, who admits no break between the different members of the Indogermanic family, but only one great continuous chain of mutual intercourse. Italic stands between Greek and Celtic, and Celtic between Italic and Germanic; Germanic, again, unites Celtic and Slavonic, etc. A modification of this theory was advanced by Leskien, who admits it as the first condition of things, but conceives a quickly entering barrier formed by natural state boundaries, which gradually prevented such intercourse and gave rise to special development of each individual element. To this latest modification Delbrück adds the warning given by recent investigation. This strikes at the data on which both the old ramification theory and the modern transition theory of Schmidt are founded. Mutual identity does not prove an original mutual community. Among new formations those elements can alone be adduced which are developed in common. Chief of these is the divided *k*-sound, *e* of European languages, *r* in the Italic middle and passive (as well as in the Celtic). Fick, however, showed that this *k* is an Indogermanic double sound; *e* is, again, also primitive; *r* of the Italic and Celtic may be, too, connected with the Indic endings *re* and *rate*. All, adds Delbrück, that we can say is that there was an original community of Indogermanic languages. It would be well not to attempt to classify them at all, with perhaps the exception of the undisputed group of Indo-Iranian. In other words, it were best to dispense with such terms as Greco-Italo-Celtic, Slavo-Germanic, and the like.

This book has been well translated by E. Channing. On comparison with the original no important deviation can be noticed, and it is high enough praise to say of any translation, as we can say of this, that it reads so smoothly that one would not suspect it was a translation. A judicious choice of words has kept the original sense of technical terms with great fidelity, and where such occur as are particularly difficult to render, the original has often been affixed. Disintegration (p. 103) does not exactly express the sense of *Verwitterung*, and it seems to us that the old *phonetic decay* is preferable. But it is at least more pleasing than the recent attempt of English translators to render this word by the extraordinary compound "weathering-away." In general, however, it were difficult to suggest alterations in the translation. The work has been well and conscientiously done—perhaps only a German scholar could appreciate how well, and how difficult it is to give us good equivalents for the German philological phraseology.

E. W. HOPKINS.